

Pam 68

//

A FULL
EXPOSITION
Of a PAMPHLET entitled,
OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
PAPERS
RELATIVE TO THE
RUPTURE with SPAIN.
IN WHICH,

The Charge with respect to a criminal Concealment
of those Papers is refuted, — the Unreasonableness of such
a Rupture at the Time of Mr. PITT's Resignation
demonstrated, — and the pretended Procrastination of that
Measure vindicated.

IN

An ANSWER from the Country-Gentleman,
TO THE
Member of PARLIAMENT'S LETTER.

Primores populi arripuit —

HOR.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. WILLIAMS, the Corner of the Mitre Tavern, in
Fleet-street, 1762.
(Price One Shilling.)

EXPOSITION
OF THE
PROGRESS
OF THE
ARTS AND MANUFACTURES
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM
OF GREAT BRITAIN
AND IRELAND
IN THE YEAR 1851



The Society of Arts, in pursuance of the Statute in that behalf made, do hereby certify that the following is a list of the names of the persons who have been elected Members of the Society since the last meeting of the Council, viz.

1. Mr. J. J. [illegible]
2. Mr. [illegible]
3. Mr. [illegible]
4. Mr. [illegible]
5. Mr. [illegible]
6. Mr. [illegible]
7. Mr. [illegible]
8. Mr. [illegible]
9. Mr. [illegible]
10. Mr. [illegible]
11. Mr. [illegible]
12. Mr. [illegible]
13. Mr. [illegible]
14. Mr. [illegible]
15. Mr. [illegible]
16. Mr. [illegible]
17. Mr. [illegible]
18. Mr. [illegible]
19. Mr. [illegible]
20. Mr. [illegible]
21. Mr. [illegible]
22. Mr. [illegible]
23. Mr. [illegible]
24. Mr. [illegible]
25. Mr. [illegible]
26. Mr. [illegible]
27. Mr. [illegible]
28. Mr. [illegible]
29. Mr. [illegible]
30. Mr. [illegible]
31. Mr. [illegible]
32. Mr. [illegible]
33. Mr. [illegible]
34. Mr. [illegible]
35. Mr. [illegible]
36. Mr. [illegible]
37. Mr. [illegible]
38. Mr. [illegible]
39. Mr. [illegible]
40. Mr. [illegible]
41. Mr. [illegible]
42. Mr. [illegible]
43. Mr. [illegible]
44. Mr. [illegible]
45. Mr. [illegible]
46. Mr. [illegible]
47. Mr. [illegible]
48. Mr. [illegible]
49. Mr. [illegible]
50. Mr. [illegible]
51. Mr. [illegible]
52. Mr. [illegible]
53. Mr. [illegible]
54. Mr. [illegible]
55. Mr. [illegible]
56. Mr. [illegible]
57. Mr. [illegible]
58. Mr. [illegible]
59. Mr. [illegible]
60. Mr. [illegible]
61. Mr. [illegible]
62. Mr. [illegible]
63. Mr. [illegible]
64. Mr. [illegible]
65. Mr. [illegible]
66. Mr. [illegible]
67. Mr. [illegible]
68. Mr. [illegible]
69. Mr. [illegible]
70. Mr. [illegible]
71. Mr. [illegible]
72. Mr. [illegible]
73. Mr. [illegible]
74. Mr. [illegible]
75. Mr. [illegible]
76. Mr. [illegible]
77. Mr. [illegible]
78. Mr. [illegible]
79. Mr. [illegible]
80. Mr. [illegible]
81. Mr. [illegible]
82. Mr. [illegible]
83. Mr. [illegible]
84. Mr. [illegible]
85. Mr. [illegible]
86. Mr. [illegible]
87. Mr. [illegible]
88. Mr. [illegible]
89. Mr. [illegible]
90. Mr. [illegible]
91. Mr. [illegible]
92. Mr. [illegible]
93. Mr. [illegible]
94. Mr. [illegible]
95. Mr. [illegible]
96. Mr. [illegible]
97. Mr. [illegible]
98. Mr. [illegible]
99. Mr. [illegible]
100. Mr. [illegible]

(3)

A FULL
EXPOSITION

Of a PAMPHLET entitled,

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

P A P E R S

RELATIVE TO THE

RUPTURE with S P A I N.

DEAR SIR,

I Am to acknowledge the Favour of Yours, and as you are pleased to tell me, that — ‘ *you regret the not having it in your Power to gratify my Curiosity with ALL the Papers relative to the Rupture with Spain* ’ — Give me Leave, in my turn, to regret your having taken such abundant Pains to render *those*, you have sent, as unintelligi-

A 2

ble

ble as possible. — Could all that Cloud of Comment, upon so plain a Text, be meant to enlighten a poor Country Friend's Understanding? or shall I think it rather a wanton Trial of Skill, how far your political Legerdemain could impose upon it? — What an unfriendly Exertion of Genius! but no wonder Sincerity should subside, when Party predominates; and, indeed, the whole Tenour of your *extraordinary Observations* demonstrates with what a true Spirit of Enthusiasm you have adopted the *Cause*, determined, like many others, to make a Sacrifice of your usual Candour, Common-sense, and (I was going to say) Common-honesty in support of it. — Let not this hard Word alarm you — for whatever you may think, a Design to palm *false Doctrine* is little less culpable than an attempt to pass *false Money*; and I know no Advantage the *mental* Gambler has over the *pecuniary* One: — the Purity of Truth, like that of our Coin, ought to be preserved inviolable, and whoever debases, diminishes, or counterfeits it, has, in my opinion, but a very frail Title to the Character of an *honest*, however he may plume himself on that of an *ingenious* Man; yet, base as the Loan has
been

been, the following Remarks are intended to discharge it, though not in your *own Coin*; you have my Thoughts pure from the Mint of my Heart, unadulterated with any Alloy of *party Spleen, private Interest, factious Intention, or popular Frenzy.*

WILL you not accuse me of want of Humanity, when I frankly confess, I was far from being so deeply affected (as, I perceive, you meant I should) by all those very lamentable Lamentations, you pour forth — ‘*for not being able to gratify my Curiosity with ALL the Papers, &c.*’ — Lucky favourite Monosyllable! and which I shrewdly suspect (notwithstanding your crocodile Tears) you would not have been without, for all the rest of your notable Observations. — In what pathetic Strains is it ecchoed and re-ecchoed through almost every Page, heightened with the criminalizing Circumstances of ‘*concealing,*’ ‘*withholding,*’ ‘*garbling,*’ ‘*mutilating,*’ &c. — yet, as the Poet says, — ‘*Mark! how a plain Tale will put you down:*’ I have (which, perhaps, you did not know) unluckily been informed, that when these *Papers* were produced to Parliament, as *all* that were in *re-*
ality

ality requisite to the Point in Question, a certain *Right Honourable Gentleman* farther declared, ‘ *that if any other were thought necessary, the House would, upon a Motion, be indulged with them.*’ — What say you now? — Why was this illuminating Anecdote omitted in your *very critical* Observations? — Was it not to avoid one fatal Objection which might be made to the *Whole* of this dreadful Charge, as it evidently demonstrates, that the Minister, instead of — ‘ *endeavouring to cover and conceal*’, had put it in your power, as a Member of Parliament, to have very easily gratified me with this lamented ALL, or any Part of these *so material Desiderata* which were to reflect so much Glory on your *ministerial Hero*, and so much Infamy on his *Successor*? — Is it then possible for me to conclude — ‘ *your Concern so very sincere, that so much is withheld from the Public upon a Subject so very interesting,*’ when it appears, you might have obtained that full Satisfaction you seem so much to desire, and that too, at the Expence of fewer *Words* than you have spent *Pages* to deplore the want of it. — perhaps, a Person ‘ *so uninformed as you,*’ might labour under some difficulty to specify these

these so much desired, yet so carefully-concealed *Arcana*; but could not a Person so well informed as your *Right Honourable Friend* have effectually prompted you on this occasion, had he really been as much in earnest, as you insinuate, when — ‘ *he pressed with that honest Zeal the laying before the Public every Paper relative to the six Years Negotiation.*’

COME, come, confess the Truth now — It was not the *Communication*, but *Non-communication* of Papers that was to serve the purpose of the *discontented Cabal*. — Is it not so? — The Clamour which might artfully be excited by a *supposed* Concealment, infinitely over-ballanced the Advantage they could derive from any Publication whatever; *this* might unluckily have thrown too much Light upon the Conduct of *one Minister*, the *other* they well knew could not fail to cast, at least, a temporary Shade upon that of *another*.

BUT, surely, you forget, (or seem willing I should,) that at the time this Affair was agitated in the House, it was almost the *unanimous*

mous Opinion, 'that any Communication at all of these *Papers* was improper.'—— Would not a Minister then, who meant to avail himself of their *Concealment*, have naturally taken advantage of this parliamentary Sanction, and instead of not communicating ALL, *however unnecessary*, have prudently declined communicating ANY, *however necessary*? — Had some more sacred Records, relative to our late *Hanoverian* and *Prussian* Negotiations, been the Object of *Eclaircissement*, may one not, at least, doubt, whether your *political Favourite* would not have thought himself sufficiently justified by so authoritative a Plea, and by no means obliged to comply with such an Act of ministerial Supererogation, nor would, perhaps, — 'so warmly have pressed' 'laying before Parliament ALL, ALL *Papers* 'relative to those Transactions.'

YET, my young Politician! may not so apparently over-strained a Concern about *suppressed Papers* be apt to furnish some suspicion of your own Consciousness, that those which *have been produced* are very ineffectual for the purpose you evidently designed them? — That of *bleaching* one Minister, and
black-

blackening another. — And indeed, towards the latter end of your Performance, you are candid enough to confess the Insufficiency of your Evidence.

‘ *The infinite Importance (say you) of what is suppressed I do not pretend to determine, but the Papers are evidently thus partially laid before the Public by Administration, to justify, if possible, their Delay.*’ — Thus much for the present. — now for the past Minister.

‘ *As to the Wisdom of the WRITTEN ADVICE, it stands already proved by the Event; but before we can enter fully into that Dispute (if there can be still a Doubt) ALL the Materials, ALL the Evidence both from Papers and Facts, on which that Advice was founded, ought, in common Justice, to be laid before the Public.*’

— Is not this something like the hacknied Craft of an *Old-Bailey* Offender; who, in order to supply the want of *present Evidence*, constantly endeavours to impose a Belief upon the Court that his most material is *absent*?

B

YET,

YET, in order to give some Colour to the Accufation of Concealment, and prove that it was not entirely imaginary, you have indeed pointed out some *real Papers*, which were omitted in the Collection laid before Parliament.

‘ *Had the Public (say you) been gratified with a Sight of the Memorials and Papers relating to the Demand of Liberty to the Spanish Nation to fish on the Banks of Newfoundland, and to the other Claims equally unjust made by the Count de Fuentes; we might, with a tolerable degree of Accuracy, know something more of the present Quarrel with Spain.*’
 Again: ——— ‘ *It is undoubtedly of much Consequence to know both the Matter and Expressions of that Memorial returned by Spain as inadmissible, as it might probably relate to one of the three Points in Negotiation, Prizes, Logwood, or the Fishery;*’ and so certainly it did; and yet of what consequence was it, to know either the *Matter* or *Expressions* of it, unless a Memorial on those Articles only was *relative to the present Rupture with Spain*. A circumstance, you are to observe, which could alone determine the
propriety

propriety of their being *produced*, and constitute any *Criminality* in the *Concealment*.

—— Is it then a sufficient ground of Accusation merely to say *Papers* have *not* been produced, without attempting at least some shadow of Proof, that those *Papers* were in some degree *relative* to the Subject of Enquiry? if these *Papers* then, were *not relative to the present Rupture with Spain*, they were certainly never asked; and you complain ‘*they were refused* ;’ but how that can be *refused* which was never *asked* can only be proved by a kind of Logic much above my comprehension, and which I believe was never taught you at * *

THAT the Disputes concerning these three Articles are by no means *relative* to the *present Rupture with Spain*, is evident from the Declaration of War itself, which is founded entirely on other Points of Difference, as well as by Mr. Pitt’s own Letter of July 28, to Lord *Bristol*, in which, all the Satisfaction then required by *Great-Britain* is confined solely to — ‘*the INDIGNITY offered by suffering that Memorial to be delivered by the French Minister* ;’ and an EXPLANATION respect-

*' ing the naval Armaments then preparing in
' the various Ports, together with the final In-
' tentions of Spain.'*

Now, have you been able in all your critical *Observations* to discover, that any *Papers* relatives to these new, and then only pretended, Points of a Rupture with Spain are concealed, or were refused? — No; —
What then? Why, Supposition must supply the want of Reality, and Papers there must be, or at least the People made to believe so, which would have — *' diffi-
' pated this Cloud of Obscurity meant to co-
' ver it.'* — Hence, you are surprized — *' That not any Paper or Memorial from
' Spain, nor any Answer of the Court of Eng-
' land appears, since the Accession of his pre-
' sent Catholic Majesty (important as that Pe-
' riod must naturally seem to be) to the last Au-
' tumn.'* — As to any Memorial from Spain during that Time, why *should* it be produced, as it could only relate to the three Articles before mentioned; as to any Answer from England, how *could* it, when Lord Bristol's Letter informs you, that Mr. Wall complained — *' His Catholic Majesty never could obtain
' an*

*' an Answer from the British Ministry to any
' Memorial or Paper during that Time.'*

DOES not your Surprize now somewhat abate, that *Papers*, which either *never existed*, or if they had, were nothing to the *purpose*; should not have been produced.

BUT now it seems, the new Minister is become but *half* an Offender; since you allow — *an EXTRACT*, at least, of one Letter from Mr. *Pitt*, dated *July* the 28th, is actually inserted; the Answer to which is received *September* the 11th. *' Not a Syllable
' (continue you) after that Period, from this
' Court to Lord Bristol, 'till the 28th of October;
' when Lord Egremont declares, he opens his Cor-
' respondence.'* — How fortunate in this discovery of ministerial Negligence; but, alas! how unfortunate in the Application. — What, the *sedulous* Mr. *Pitt* not write a Syllable to Lord *Bristol*, from *July* the 28th to *October* the 5th, the date of his Resignation; and his *negligent* Successor opens his Correspondence with him so early as the 28th of the same Month! nay, if his Letter of *Compliment*, and *Notification* of his having been honoured with the Seals (which too has
been

been concealed) be taken in the Account, within fifteen Days of his commencing Secretary, Who then, but must agree with you that——‘ *It is indeed very astonishing, and gives no great Idea of the Vigilance or Attention of Administration, that, while Affairs were so critical between the two Nations, no Directions for the Conduct of Lord Bristol were sent to Madrid during so long a Period.*

BUT, because there appears to have been no Papers (relative to the present Rupture with Spain) concealed, that you know of, you wisely conclude, there certainly must be some,—you don’t know of. Is not this something like poor SCRUB’S Plot, which he is satisfied must be a Plot; ‘ *because he knew not what to make of it*.——Hence, in Page 10, Imagination is to supply the Deficiency of Proof. —— ‘ *Can it be imagined so acute, so well informed a minister as Mr. STANLEY certainly was, should not transmit from Paris any Intelligence of that most alarming Treaty which was negotiating all the Summer at Paris, especially as LORD TEMPLE, in a great Assembly, did declare, that Intelligence of the highest Moment, relative to these Matters,*

‘ *was*

‘ was transmitted to this Court, before the
 ‘ *Advice in Writing*, dated the 18th of Septem-
 ‘ ber, which occasioned certain Resignations.’

True, Lord TEMPLE did declare in a great Assembly, ‘ that they had Intelligence of the
 ‘ *biggest Moment*,’ strongly hinting, that it was a Copy of the *Family Compact* itself, or a Certainty at least, not only that such a Treaty existed, at that time, but that it was *injurious* and *destructive* of the *Neutrality* SPAIN professed, and we had a Right to; for nothing short of that could justify an *immediate* Declaration of War, as we stood circumstanced at that Period: and this *Intelligence* he asserted was previous to, and the Foundation of their wise *Advice in Writing*, and of their *well-timed* Resignations which followed it, from the *Indocility* and *Disobedience* of the KING and his MINISTERS ‘ *inspired*’ and ‘ *uninspired*.’ I have also heard, that he was flatly contradicted by another NOBLE PERSON, told
 ‘ That they could know *no* such Thing: —
 ‘ That there was no Intelligence of such a
 ‘ Fact so constituted at that time, that could
 ‘ be depended upon, — challenged him to
 ‘ produce it, — wished he knew where it was
 ‘ to

' to be found, that he might be an Advocate with the KING to lay it before the ' *House.*' — Did your *Friend* attempt to *justify* himself in his Place, — Did he *persist* in his Assertion *so explained*, and declare, that he had the Poofs in his Power, — That nothing but his Oath, as a Councillor, hindered him from producing them, — Did he demand of that NOBLE PERSON to make good his promise, and to procure from the Crown a *Dispensation* from the Oath, and full Liberty to lay before that *Assembly* all he knew, — Did he do this, *then*, or *can*, or *will* he do it *now*? I am apt to think not; because I have heard that the same NOBLE PERSON has *twice* since this Debate thrown down the Gauntlet in the same Place, and to the same Purpose, which was not taken up by those who are thought to have authorized you to clamour for *Papers, Lights, Informations, &c.* knowing, at the same time, that they *might have had*, and now *may have* them for asking, nor dare to ask, because they know they will come out against them. — And thus far this NOBLE PERSON has ventured, trusting solely to the Strength of his *natural Parts*, without any Assistance from the ' *Inspiration*'*

'*spiration*'* you impute to him, and indeed I should advise him to trust on, for if his *Inspiration* serves him no better in the *Business* of his Office, than it did in his *Choice*, when he thought proper to *distinguish your Employers* by his *Friendship* neither himself nor his Country will be much beholden to it.

THUS much for the long-laboured, ill-proved and wickedly intentioned *Charge* of a *designed* ministerial Concealment. — Which I think evidently appears to have had *Clamour* not *Conviction* for its Object.

THE other two Points of Crimination which you seem so zealous to establish in your critical *Observations* are

THAT even those *Papers* which have been produced, contain sufficient Evidence, that
C there

* Page 31 (say you) — '*Two S——s of S——e in these dangerous Times become Ministers by INSPIRATION.*' — Aye — and by the noblest kind of *Inspiration* too, an ardent Desire and undaunted Resolution to serve their Country, even in these *dangerous Times*. But how came these *Dangers*? Must not the Person who had had the *Guidance* of our *Measures* be supposed to have some small share in creating them, and with what kind of *Inspiration* must he be

there really existed a *just* and *necessary* Cause for a declared Rupture with *Spain*, at, and long before, the Time of Mr. *Pitt*'s resigning the *Seals*. — And

THAT a Failure in not seizing that *political Punctum*, he *alone* so sagaciously discovered, has been attended with the most fatal Disadvantages, by affording the Enemy an opportunity of making such Preparations as may render the War less successful and much more expensive to *Great-Britain*.

BUT should the *first* of these appear to be intirely *inconclusive*, the *other* totally *unwarranted*, and your Charge of Concealment has proved a *dowright Fib*, What opinion can I entertain of your Candour, or the Justice of a Cause which requires such *treacherous Supports*, in which Reason must be prostituted, and Truth violated by palming upon the Public, Chicane for Argument, and Fiction for Fact?

SHOULD

be possessed, who meanly deserts the Service of his Country in the *midst* of them?

SHOULD these Remarks appear somewhat immethodical and less connected than I could wish, you must blame yourself for it; as I find you have purposely avoided any regular Plan in your Attack; and, the more effectually to amuse and deceive, *skip and pop* from *Paper to Paper*, like the *Indian* in Battle, who *dodges* from *Bush to Bush* the better to secure himself from the Danger of a *regular Approach*.

WHEN I reflect how necessary the Support of this fallacious Doctrine, viz. — ‘*That a JUST and NECESSARY Cause for an immediate Rupture with Spain actually existed at the Time of a certain Resignation*’ — is, to the Existence of your Patron’s *Popularity*, I do not wonder at your remarkable Zeal to maintain what every Artifice, disappointed Ambition could invent, has been practised to *inculcate* for this Purpose. How has every Tongue been *employed*; How has every Press been *prostituted*, Government *insulted*, Mobs *cajoled*, Addresses *solicited*, and even the Dignity of the Crown itself *violated*? — But a fair State of the Disputes between the two Nations, when Mr. *Pitt* resigned the

Seals, will best explain the *patriot* Intention of your *political* Idol, with respect to that very extraordinary Part of his Conduct.

THE only Differences negotiated between *Great-Britain* and *Spain* when Mr. *Pitt* wrote his last Letter to Lord *Bristol*, dated 28th of *July*, were concerning

1st. THE *Claim* made by the *Spaniards*, conveyed in the *Memorial* presented to our Court by Mr. *Bussy*, the *French* Minister.

2dly. THE *Indignity* offered the Crown of *Great-Britain*, by suffering that *Claim* to be conveyed through so improper a Channel. ——— And,

3dly, AN *Explanation*, with Respect to the *Destination* of the *naval Armaments* and *final Intentions* of *Spain*.

THE CLAIMS made by *Spain*, with regard to the *Fishery*, *Prizes*, and our *Settlements* upon the *Logwood-coasts*, are not pretended, even by the most infatuated Advocates of this belligerent Minister, to be a
suf-

sufficient Cause for *our* declaring against that Power; and, indeed, Mr. *Pitt* himself, in his Letter, acknowledges them a more proper Object of *Negotiation* than *War*, at least, on our Part. — Had this *alone* afforded a justifiable Foundation for a Rupture with *Spain*, what must we think even of his own *militant* Administration, who, during the whole Course of his Ministry, passively postponed exerting that laudable Spirit, he has so much plumed himself upon, on some *other Occasions*: — A tame Acquiescence, for so many Years, would give him no very graceful Title, to reproach his Successor with a *Delay* of scarce half the Number of Months.

LET me observe farther, that, the Crown of *Spain*, in this Case, appears to be no more than a *Claimant* of that, which we will at present suppose only a pretended right. — Is then the mere *claiming* such a hostile Defiance as merits the Chastisement of *War*; or is an express desire — ‘ *to terminate it by amicable Means*’ — sufficient Provocation for immediately declaring it? — Are these such acts of *Aggression* as either the Law of God, the Law of
Na-

Nature, or the Law of Nations point out as a reasonable Foundation for a *declared Rupture*?—Was not the Crown of *Great Britain* in actual and unmolested Possession of these Rights which *Spain* claimed? and, therefore, could she look upon herself as any Thing more than a *political Defendant* in this Cause? — Were we not in *quiet Possession* of those *Settlements* upon the *Logwood-Coasts*, which *Spain* complained, and, indeed, we acknowledged, was a *Trespass* on the territorial Jurisdiction of that Power? — Were we not in *sole Occupation* of that *Fishery*, which *Spain* only desired the Liberty of proving *what Right* (if any) they had to a Share in it? — Were not the *Prizes* secure in our *own Ports*, and applied to the Benefit of their several Captors, while *Spain* only requested the Legality of those Prizes might be determined by a *friendly Negotiation*? — Had *Spain* committed at this Time one *hostile Ou-vert Act* towards dispossessing us of *those Settlements* we held by so very disputable a Title? — Had *Spain* made any Attempt to force the Exercise of that Privilege she claimed to the *Fishery*, or, — Had she endeavoured, by any Exertion of naval Power, to recover those

those *Prizes*, or make Reprizals in lieu of them? — What then, in the Name of Common-Sense, in the Name of Common-Honesty, should, in such a Situation, induce *Great Britain* to a declared Rupture with *Spain*? — Would not such a Proceeding imply the ridiculous Idea of a Defendant commencing the Law-Suit, and bringing a Writ of *Recovery* for that of which he was already in *Possession*?

FROM these Considerations, I think it is evident, that this *first Article* of Difference with *Spain* concerning their *Claim* neither was, could, or was even pretended a *just* and *necessary* Cause for a declared Rupture with that Power, at the Time of Mr. *Pitt's* Resignation,

LET us now see how far *Spain's* permitting these *Claims* to be intimated (intimated, only, I say) by the *French Minister* constitutes such an Offence, as nothing but the Penalty of War, on her Part, can *expiate*, and the Effusion of our own Blood and Treasure *avenge*.

THOUGH,

THOUGH, no one entertains a more delicate Idea than myself, of the due Decorum and nice Punctilios that ought to be observed between the Crowns of independent Powers, yet I do not think it impossible, but the Resentment of a Breach of them may be over-strained even in *public*, as well as in *private* Affairs; and though Mr. Pitt seems, in this particular Instance, to be so rigid an Asserter of the punctual Observance of them, yet, I believe some Instances, even from the Authority of these *very Papers*, may be produced to shew, that He himself has not always been totally *immaculate* in this Point: —but taking this ‘*unparalleled Memorial*’ in the most flagrant Light, does it contain any Thing more than, a ‘PROPOSAL of an ‘*Accommodation between the two Nations*’ — ‘*a RECOMMENDATION, that the Articles therein mentioned may be adjusted according to the ‘Justice of the two Sovereigns,*’ and—‘WISHES ‘*that some Medium may be found to content the ‘English and Spanish Nations on the Points in ‘dispute?*’ — Now, do *Proposals, Recommendations, and Wishes* breathe such a Spirit of *Insult and Insolence*, or partake so much of that

that '*Enormity and extreme Offensiveness*'—
Mr. Pitt complains of?

BUT how comes the 'MATTER' of this Memorial to be so peculiarly offensive at this Juncture? was it not the same Mr. Pitt had condescended to treat on during his whole Ministry? And if the MODE of Presentation only, is to constitute the Enormity, altho' *France*, as an hostile Power, may possibly be deemed guilty of *Insolence* in delivering it, yet, surely, *Spain* can be accused of little more than *Indiscretion* in permitting it; especially, as it appears she afterwards modestly *withdrew* it, rather than it should prove any Obstacle to the Peace then negotiating: and, really, I don't remember, that *Grotius*, *Puffendorf*, or any other Author in their Treatises, *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, have enumerated *Indiscretion* among those political Blasphemies, or Sins, which are *never* to be forgiven.

LET us then suppose this a high Breach of Decorum; yet, as it was unattended with any *real* or apparently *designed* Injury, should the all-conquering Spirit of a Minis-

D

ter

ter immediately take Fire, and insist, that the Throats of a whole Nation ought to be cut, for this *un-injurious Incivility*? might not some other Nations, besides that of *Spain*, be apt to suspect, he really was in some degree possessed with that——‘*Spirit of Haughtiness and Discord*,’ which has so falsely been ascribed to him?

BUT, to prove, that this High Crime and Misdemeanour was not totally inexpressible, nor thought so even by Mr. *Pitt* himself, we find him, in his Letter, recommending to Lord *Bristol*, —‘*That if his Lordship should perceive any Disposition in Mr. Wall to explain it away, he would with readiness and his usual Address adapt himself to so desirable a Circumstance, and open to the Court of Madrid as handsome a Retreat as may be.*’ — Nay, we find Mr. *Pitt* equally inclined to Forgiveness, even tho’ the *Spanish* Minister should avow this Memorial, without any Explanation at all, when, in the same Letter, he writes — ‘*in case the Spanish Minister shall avow that this strange Piece has really been authorized by the Court of Madrid, your Excellency will express, with the utmost Seriousness, to Mr. Wall, that*

‘ that nothing can equal the King’s Surprise
 ‘ and Regret at a Transaction so unprecedented,
 ‘ except his Majesty’s steady Purpose and im-
 ‘ moveable Determination not to be diverted, by
 ‘ any Considerations, from that even Tenor of
 ‘ Conduct towards Spain which his just and con-
 ‘ stant Care of his People dictates, and which
 ‘ his Royal Wisdom and Magnanimity have
 ‘ hitherto pursued. ——— Happy reconcilia-
 ting Spirit ! and which the Spanish Monarch,
 we find, was not too proud to adopt ; for,
 by a Paper delivered to Lord Bristol, Au-
 gust the 28th, Mr. Wall declares, — ‘ That
 ‘ it was not his Catholic Majesty’s Intention,
 ‘ in consenting to Mr. Bussy’s delivering that
 ‘ Memorial, to OFFEND the Dignity of the
 ‘ Crown of Great Britain, or retard its
 ‘ Peace : on the contrary, to consolidate it, and,
 ‘ in all human possibility, to perpetuate it.’ —
 Again, — ‘ Spain only consented that France,
 ‘ inasmuch as it not only appeared INOFFENSIVE,
 ‘ &c. — Again — ‘ That if the Catholic King
 ‘ had thought the Delivery of the Memorial had
 ‘ been construed an Intimation and a THREAT,
 ‘ he would never have consented to it.’

BEHOLD, then, the regular Progress of this enormous Irregularity ; an Affront is—*supposed*, —*resented*, —*excused*, and if Mr. Pitt was not more implacable and haughty than a Spaniard himself, it is to be supposed — *forgiven*. What, then, after all this, would you have it —*punished*—too ? which certainly must be the case, if you pretend this Article of Difference afforded any *just* and *necessary* Cause for a *declared Rupture* with Spain, at the Time of Mr. Pitt's Resignation.

THE remaining Article of Dispute with Spain, at that Period, was concerning an *Explanation with respect to the Destination of the Armaments then preparing, and the final Intentions of Spain*.

I AM not *Casuis*t enough to determine how far, one independent Power is obliged to satisfy the Curiosity of another on this Point ; but imagine, if the Demand is founded only on some vague, *bearsay* indeterminate Presumptions, even a Refusal, in such a Case, would hardly be deemed sufficient Foundation for the commencement of actual Hostilities : but, surely, when an *explicit*
and

and categorical Eclaircissement (all that was asked) is submitted to, no Pretence whatever can remain for such a violent Proceeding. — What did Mr. *Pitt* demand? ‘*an Explanation.*’ What has the Court of *Spain* given? *an Explanation.* Aye, and such a one as I could hardly have imagined a Court, whose Pride is even proverbial, would have submitted to: — ‘Not only the whole Force enumerated, but the *particular Destination* of almost each single Ship accounted for, with the strongest Assurances of the most *friendly Intentions*, and Desire to cultivate the Amity of *Great Britain.*’

FROM this fair and candid State of the Differences subsisting between the two Crowns at *this Period*, it seems evident, that the Complaints and Demands contained in Mr. *Pitt's* Letter of *July 28*, furnished no very justifiable Pretence for an *immediate Rupture* with *Spain*; and, surely, much less so, when, by the Answer received the 11th of *September*, we find those very Complaints *removed*, and Demands *satisfied*. — Why all this Art, then? — Why all this Industry to impose and enforce this *fallacious Error*, unless, by hanging out false Colours, you hope

to

to divert the Public (somewhat recovered from its long popular Delusion) from a Discovery of the *real* Motives that occasioned this *much lamented* (I find) though *lucrative* Resignation, and induced your *Patron*, like a peevish hungry *Boy*, because he could not be indulged with the *whole* Cake, furlily to refuse his *proper Share* of it.

TELL me, (if the Cabal allows you one grain of Sincerity) was it not for this purpose, you have taken such indefatigable Pains in *shuffling, cutting, pricking, and packing* these *Papers*, like a Jugler with the Cards, who hopes, by the Power of his Art, to deceive the Credulous, and make them believe what their Common-sense knows to be impossible?

BUT, like an infidel Priest who does not believe one Word he preaches, I find, you too would impose a *political Article*, that seems to be no Part of your own *Creed*; for had you really believed, that a *just and necessary* Cause for an immediate Rupture with *Spain* subsisted at the Time of Mr. *Pitt's* Resignation,

signation, would you have had recourse to the disputable Evidence of *Events*, in proof of it? — ‘ *As to the Wisdom of the written Advice, it stands already proved by the Event.*’

———— How so, my young Logician, what, because War was declared with *Spain* three Months *after* Mr. Pitt’s Abdication of Government, and that upon *new Occasions* and *fresh Contingencies*, therefore Mr. Pitt’s *Wisdom* is confirmed for proposing that Declaration three Months *before*, when *no* such Causes existed. — May not *one* Declaration be founded on the Principles of Equity, Justice and Policy, and the *other* be destitute of every one of these Principles to support it? and if what has before been observed is true, it certainly would have been so.

DECLARATION of War, can only be warranted by some actual or manifestly intended Injury; and whenever the Aggressor is ready to make Reparation, to draw, or not to sheath the Sword is Treason against the Law of Arms itself, War becomes Murder, and the Spoils of the Victors can only be deemed the Plunder of a Banditti.

As

As this *eventual* Declaration of War against Spain is to be deemed a Proof of your Patron's WISDOM, so (it seems) the *Continuation* of the German War is to be held an Adoption of his EXAMPLE. ——— ‘*May our Army*’ (you pray) ‘*in Germany (since it is still to continue there, tho’ Mr. Pitt is retired,) and the Kings of PRUSSIA and PORTUGAL find, that EXAMPLE has indeed been taken of the Spirit of the late Measures.*’ ——— But does a temporary Continuation of that War, absolutely imply an Approbation of it? ——— May not a War be as rashly concluded, as it was wickedly commenced? ——— Is no Time, no Address, no Policy requisite to extricate one Minister from a Measure in which he has been involved by another, altho’ he should most sincerely disapprove it? ——— Will he, who has formed the *Labyrinth*, accuse the Person he has *led* and *left* in it, for continuing there, only till he can find the *Clue* proper to wind himself out of it; and audaciously assert, that his going on (which is solely owing to the Impossibility of *immediately* going back) is an humble Confession of the Superiority of his Talents, and a *following of his* EXAMPLE?

2A

No;

No; — to follow *his* Example, the present MINISTER* must have refused a *single Man* to a *Westphalian* War, tho' headed by a Son of the Crown — and this — *to gain the People*; then, afterwards have squandered more Blood and Treasure upon it, than all the Ministers since the Revolution — *to gain a K—g*, who left no road open to Ambition but through *Germany*. — He must have *rejected* a *Peace* which a Spirit of Quixotism had rendered almost absolutely *necessary*, and *run away* from a *War* which Profusion had made almost absolutely *impracticable*. — He must, by a Series of haughty contemptuous Treatment, have blown up a War of *Peevishness* and *Personality*, from Points which, negotiated with Common-decency, Common-sense, and Common-honesty, could not have created so much as a Coldness between two reasonable Powers: — And to crown all, he must have received the greatest *private Reward* for these *exemplary Services*, and repayed them by the

E greatest

* Why I say *Minister* only, is, because your Attack is partially confined to a *particular One*, but who, it is well known, is far from ambitiously arrogating to himself the *sole* and *arbitrary* GUIDANCE of our 'MEASURES,' however a late ministerial *Vizier* may have resented his not being permitted to exercise, in a free Country, this unconstitutional Authority. — *Hinc illæ lachrymæ.* —

greatest *public Insults*. ——— This would, indeed, be *following* his *EXAMPLE*; but whether it would be ranked amongst the '*Glories*' or '*Disgraces*' of his Life, I must leave your untainted Impartiality to decide.

HOWEVER, I think we have some reason to hope, that the *Example* of the *past Minister* is not entirely the Polar Star of our *present political Pilot*, since I do not remember to have heard, that the very *singular Treaty*,* concluded with the King of *Prussia* has yet, or is ever likely to be renewed under his Administration: ——— A Treaty by which the *Dignity* and *Independence* of the Crown of *Great-Britain* was negotiated away, without any one Stipulation in its *Favour*, unless a GERMAN PRINCE graciously condescending to accept our *tributary Blood and Bullion* may be deemed such.

WHEN I first sat down, I intended to confine these Remarks to the two, seemingly, favourite,

* Would not a certain Gentleman (if Modesty was any part of his Characteristic) do well to consider that no *Treaty of Peace* whatever, which may be concluded by his Successor can possibly be attended with greater *Disgrace* and *Disadvantage* than this *Treaty of War* has been.

favourite, and, indeed, only essential Points of your Performance :

THE *Calumnation* of a *present* Minister for a *designed Suppression* of Papers, necessary to the Information of the Public. — And

THE *Justification* of a *late* Minister for vacating his place in the Administration, upon his ADVICE not being complied with, by Government, for an immediate Rupture with *Spain*.

BUT, as there remains another Article of ministerial Crimination, with regard to the fatal Consequences that attended *delaying* the Declaration of War against that Power, I shall add a few cursory Remarks on that Head, for my own, tho' perhaps not much to your Satisfaction.

‘ *Whoever (say you) considers the Situation*
 ‘ *of Spain, unprepared as she was at that Time*
 ‘ *the written Advice was given, with respect to*
 ‘ *her Ports, her Ships of War in those Ports,*
 ‘ *her Colonies, her Commerce, her own, as well*

' as the Riches of France on board her Ships,
' can never sufficiently lament the Loss of an
' autumnal Campaign.'

LAMENTING again:— But does not this declamatory Lamentation partake somewhat more of the Orator than Politician? How exactly characteristic of your *speaking Leader*; how calculated to *move*; how un-calculated to *convince*? — Would it not have been a little more satisfactory had you condescended to specify a few of the Disadvantages we have suffered, or Advantages we have lost by this all-ruining peaceful Chasm of '*three whole months*!' — Had you discovered what *Enterprizes* have been *effected*, — What *Plans* have been *executed*, — What *Conquests* obtained by the Enemy during this '*critical Period*,' would it not in some measure have fortified the Charge? But how unlucky is it, (and don't you *lament* this likewise) that it does not appear any of these have even been *attempted*, consequently could not have been *prevented*! — Has any *British* Squadron been led captive by the *Spanish* Flag: — Has any Merchant become Bankrupt by the Success of a *Spanish* Privateer;

teer : — Has *Gibraltar* been taken, or *Ireland* invaded : — Has any of these *Disadvantages* happened, although the War has now *actually* been declared upwards of three Months ? — Are not her Ships *still* in her Ports, and safely blocked up too, if one of the most gallant *Fleets* that ever awed their Coasts can be supposed *efficient* for that Purpose ?

BUT, it seems, our Ministry was informed by Lord *Bristol*, — ‘ *That eleven large Ships of the Line were lying at FERROL, rigged, manned, and ready to put to Sea at a short Warning, together with two Frigates, one of which is bound to the South-Seas,*’ — and, for what you know or have heard, are not these Ships at *FERROL still*, tho’ rigged and manned : and has that *short warning*, as yet, been given for their *sailing*, though we have been so considerable a time at *declared War* with the Enemy ? — Aye, — but — ‘ *Two of the Catholic King’s Ships of War actually sailed from Barcelona in October, with two large Ships under their Convoy loaded with military Stores, said to be destined for the Spanish West-Indies.*’ Well, and what then, my critical Observer, could that have been prevented

prevented, even in *point of Time*, had a Declaration of War commenced at the *Date* of your Friend's Resignation? But suppose that early enough, — Is it impossible they should have escaped the Vigilance of our Fleet? — Have not Ships passed and re-passed from the Ports of *France* in spite of your *Argus-eyed* Minister; nay, has not a *Flag* of that Nation lately sailed proudly forth, notwithstanding that naval *precautionary Power* which has for so many Years, at a most enormous Expence, been stationed there to prevent it, the only apparent Object of their Destination, unless we add, that of ostentatiously parading round a SAND-BANK, purchased at the Price of *Millions*, to swell the List of your *political Hero's* important military Atchievements.

BUT now comes the *captivating Charm*, the *magic Spell*, that is to freeze every *British* Heart to Stone, or, rather, the *Firebrand*, which, like that of the *EPHESIAN*, is to consume the Temple of *ministerial Fame*, and at the same time immortalize the *Incendiaries*: — ‘*The FLOTA, — the FLOTA*
‘*— is safe in the Ports of Spain.*’ — Did
not

not Lord *Bristol*, by a Letter dated the 21st of September, inform the Ministry, — ‘ *That a Messenger arrived at St. Ildefonso the Week before, with the News of the safe Arrival of the Flota in the Bay of Cadiz?*’ But what Inference follows from this, in proof of any Disadvantage *Great-Britain* suffered from not coming to a Rupture with *Spain*, at the time this boasted *written Advice* was given; does it not appear, that this rich, much wished-for Prize was safe in Harbour long before that *Advice* was given; and would you have had us seiz’d it before such an Act of Hostility was authorized even by your own impatient and not over-scrupulously nice Minister? — But, why do I ask this Question? — Do I not find it under your own Hand, — that the *Utile* has so entirely engrossed your political attention, the *Honestum* seems totally forgot; or would you, when speaking of the Destruction of the *Spanish* Marine in the Year 1718, by Sir *George Byng*, have applauded that Measure and say, — ‘ *The POLICY and SPIRIT of it was universally admired; as to the JUSTICE of such a Proceeding I determine nothing.*’ — Excellent *Machiavel*: — But let me tell you, however the Splendor of
Victory

Victory may dazzle, 'tis the Ray of Justice must give it true Lustre; the Observance of this cardinal Virtue is no less necessary to establish the Renown of a State, than the most successful Effort of Arms; it was to this that *Sparta*, during the Purity of its Government, owed its Power and Influence both in *Greece* and *Asia*, more than to the Edge of their Swords and Points of their Spears: ——— Successful War may obtain a Kingdom *temporary Power*, but approved Virtue must secure it *lasting Authority*.

In another Letter, dated *November* the 2d, Lord *Bristol* (you say) writes, that ———
 ‘ *Two Ships have lately arrived at Cadiz, with*
 ‘ *very extraordinary rich Cargoes, from the*
 ‘ *West-Indies,*’ SO THAT ALL THE WEALTH
 THAT WAS EXPECTED FROM SPANISH
 AMERICA IS NOW SAFE IN OLD SPAIN. Tho’
 the Possibility and Rectitude of seizing these
 Ships are subject to the same Objections as
 have before been offered, yet, surely, it af-
 fords no very convincing Proof of the Dis-
 advantages we suffered from the three Months
 Delay in declaring War: ——— For if all
 the Wealth expected *that Year* was then
 safe

safe in *Old Spain*, what advantage could accrue, in this Point at least, from a *more early* determination of that Measure?

BUT, with regard to the *Flota*, it may not be altogether foreign to the purpose, to consider how far prudential Reasons should have induced us to be somewhat tender in that Point.— Had those Ships been seized before a *declared Rupture*, as had they been seized at all, they certainly must have been, even tho' that Rupture had immediately ensued upon the *written Advice*,— Would not many Powers with whom we are in *Alliance*, as well as many of our *own Subjects* who are greatly interested in the safety of that valuable Cargo; would not these, I say, have been apt to complain of a Loss sustained by such a Violation of public Faith and the Law of Nations; and could a Minister who proposed that Violence, however *unembarrassed* He might boast his Countenance, have preserved a total inflexibility of Muscles when reproached with *robbing* even his *best Friends*, especially when he knew, he could make them no Compensation? For, as the Captures become the Property of those that

F

take

take them, no public Distribution could be made, however equitable to these friendly Sufferers. — How then could — ‘ Every Practice of the most civilized States, every Formality prescribed by the Law of Nations, every Proceeding which the most scrupulous Rules of good Faith could require, have been preserved, and the noblest Opportunity of expeditiously and gloriously terminating both a French and a Spanish War been seized, which is now irrecoverably lost? How could — ‘ The firmest NERVES of Spain, and with them the last Hopes of France, soon have been withered, and the British empire have received greater and more important Acquisitions than any it yet can boast from the unparalleled and dazzling successes even of this glorious War?’ —

Exquisite Rhodomontade! — But after this, must not I think you possessed of a Countenance even more unembarrassed than that of your Patron himself, especially, when I find you accusing a present Minister of — ‘ Weakness, Indecision, or a delusive Hope at best, in giving to our determined Enemy that time to prepare which it was notorious she wanted; lose the Season for Action, and sacrifice

‘ *fice to the Imbecility of a few more LAST WORDS*
‘ *three most important Months, at the End of*
‘ *which we found ourselves reduced to the ne-*
‘ *cessity of breaking with Spain, EXACTLY AS*
‘ WE OUGHT TO HAVE DONE SO LONG BE-

FORE.’

Now as all these mighty *Preparations* appear to be *imaginary*, — that *Season for Action* impossible to exist, — and tho’ *patient* enough to wait for the *last Word*, we have been *prudent* enough to secure the *first Blow*: What then becomes of this favourite conclusion, — *exactly as we ought to have done so long before?*

HAD *Spain* even received *some Advantage* from this procrastinated Delay (as you term it) is it impossible but *Great Britain* might still have received *more* — Do not the Principles of Policy and Prudence require that a proper Regard should be had to our own Situation as well as that of the Enemy? Let us then candidly consider the *particular Period* which our State *Alchymist* had chose for the Point of *militant Projection* — a Period during the Recess of Parliament —

an exhausted Exchequer, and when every Invention was to be racked, every Scheme contrived to raise the Supplies necessary for carrying on the War in which the Nation was *already* engaged, with *one Part* of which (tho' your Patron's favourite) the Public, however infatuated by their *popular* *Miss-Leader*, began now to be greatly dissatisfied, as being by much the most bloody, expensive, and, at the same time, totally *unnational*: in this Situation of Affairs, might not the *immediate Promulgation* of a new War, supposing it justifiable by all the Rules of national Faith, Justice, and Honour, have created such an Alarm as very sensibly to have affected *Public Credit*? Might not an Apprehension of the vast Supplies that *would be necessary*, create a Deficiency in those that *really were so*, and Government be distressed by the exorbitant Demands of those who are always ready enough to avail themselves of its *Necessities*? — Would not this be acting like the *foolish Architect* in the Gospel, who began a Building, but sat not first down to compute the *Expence of it*.

— *for the Point of certain Position* — *the Record of Parliament* — **HOWEVER,**

HOWEVER, you might — ‘ be surpriz’d,’
 I believe you was really ‘ concerned’ at —
 ‘ The Alarm spread every where in our Parts, of
 ‘ the melancholy and ruined State of our Country,’
 as such an Alarm could reflect no great Glory
 on him who had had the GUIDANCE of our
 MEASURES, and whether true or false, im-
 plied at least some disagreeable Decay of his
 POPULARITY. — I fear, indeed, with you —
 ‘ There are still some among us, who will be
 ‘ found to repine at future Successes, and weep
 ‘ over Victories,’ though truly British, and to
 whom the Picture of Envy you mention,
 may with more propriety be applied:

‘ Vixque tenet lachrymas, quia nil lachrymabile cernit.’

AFTER what has appeared in these Re-
 marks, I must suppose your Surprize at least
 abated, what ever your Concern may be —
 ‘ That only two Resignations have accompanied
 ‘ that of the late Secretary;’ — and when
 I consider the pecuniary Gratification he re-
 ceived for his, am tempted to think, *Voltaire*
 was full as well acquainted with our *Minister*
 as our ‘ Country:’

*‘Je suis Anglois, je dois faire le bien
De mon pays, mais plus encore le mien.’*

You will not (I dare say) doubt my Sincerity, whatever little scruples I may have concerning yours, when I assure you, that I heartily wish, with you, ——— ‘*That the Dignity of the Crown, the Honour of his Majesty, the Glory of the Nation, and the important Acquisitions made by a late Minister, may be safe in the Hands of the present;*’ and indeed, who can doubt it, when we see him not rashly courting War, nor meanly declining it: — Jealous of his Country’s Glory, yet careful of its Honour: — Prudent in adopting his Measures, vigorous in the Execution of them: — Planting LAURELS on the Brow of his SOVEREIGN, which no Blaft of REPROACH can wither. Such are ‘*the eminent Glories*’ of this ‘*procrastinating Minister’s Life.*’ What then (say you) ‘*would his Disgraces be?*’ I will tell you, — His Disgrace would be, — to resemble the Character of ACHITOPHEL — drawn by our great English Poet, a Character, not totally unapplicable to a more modern Councillor, and who,
in-

indeed, seems to be almost *equally affected* with ACHITOPHEL himself, that his FOOLISH ADVICE was *disregarded*.

I am, Yours, &c.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE AUTHOR of the *preceding Remarks*, had no Design to communicate them to the Public, 'till he found the *Pamphlet* which is the Subject of them, was so industriously propagated as the *Creed* of a *Faction*, and enforced by the *weekly Commentaries* of that *judicious, candid, decent, political Pyrotechnist* THE MONITOR.

(17)
indicated to be almost entirely
with the former, and his position



Page, Town, etc.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author of the preceding Re-
marks has no Design to communi-
cate them to the Public, till he found the
Subject which is the Subject of them,
was so industriously propagated as the Creed
of a Party, and enforced by the weighty
Commentaries of that illustrious, candid,
learned, political, Pyrotechnist, The
Editor.

